1			
2			
3			
4	BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL		
5	OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA		
6	* * *		
7	IN THE MATTER OF:		
8	DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND		
9	BUSINESS SERVICES on behalf of the CITY OF LAS VEGAS,		
10	Petitioner,		
11	vs. COMPLAINT FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION		
12	SNICK'S PLACE, INC., dba		
13	SNICK'S PLACE; DOMINICK RALPH VITALE,		
14	Respondents.		
15			
16	The DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND BUSINESS SERVICES, on behalf of the		
17	CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA ("Department" or "City"), Petitioner, makes this		
18	Complaint for Disciplinary Action against SNICK'S PLACE, INC., dba SNICK'S PLACE		
19	("SNICK'S PLACE"); and DOMINICK RALPH VITALE ("VITALE"), together referred to		
20	as RESPONDENTS ("Respondents"), 1402 South Third Street, Las Vegas, Clark County,		
21	Nevada, and states:		
22	Respondents hold a Tavern License No. L16-00134-4-000843; a Restricted Gaming		
23	License No. G01-00410-4-000843; a Convention Hall Gaming Tax License No. C20-00410-7-		
24	000843; a Coin Amusement Machine License No. C08-01083-2-000843.		
25	SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS		
26	Snick's Place is located at 1402 South Third Street, Las Vegas, Nevada holds, among		
27	other licenses, a restricted gaming license, a privileged license and is incorporated under the		
28			

laws of the State of Nevada and Vitale being the sole shareholder, officer and director of the business and was licensed as such on or about July 18, 2001.

Beginning on or about April 29, 2008 and continuing until present, Respondent failed to prevent certain unlawful conduct to occur within the premises of the business and became subject to license revocation/suspension proceedings initiated by the State of Nevada Gaming Control Board as well as the City.

On or about December 30, 2008, a complaint (NGC Case No. 08-14) was filed against the Respondents by the State of Nevada before the Nevada Gaming Commission to which the Respondents admitted the violations of state law by stipulation dated March 9, 2009. The stipulated settlement agreement was accepted by the Nevada Gaming Commission and became effective by its Order, dated March 19, 2009. Respondents' state licenses were suspended and an agreed to fine in the amount of \$50,000.00 was imposed. Other conditions also were included in the settlement.

### SPECIFIC FACTUAL STATEMENT

On or about April 29, 2008, two patrons of Snick's Place engaged in sexual intercourse. The action set out above took place in the public portion of Snick's Place. This was in an area for which the bartenders on duty were responsible. The RESPONDENTS failed to prevent the action set out above.

On or about April 30, 2008, one patron of Snick's Place masturbated another patron. The action set out above took place in the public portion of Snick's Place. This was in an area for which the bartenders on duty were responsible. The RESPONDENTS failed to prevent the action set out above.

On or about April 30, 2008, two patrons of Snick's Place performed oral sex on each other. The action set out above took place in the public portion of Snick's Place. This was in an area for which the bartenders on duty were responsible. The RESPONDENTS failed to prevent the action set out above.

On or about May 1, 2008, two patrons of Snick's Place completely disrobed and one proceeded to masturbate the other. The action set out above took place in the public portion of

Snick's Place. This was in an area for which the bartenders on duty were responsible. The RESPONDENTS failed to prevent the action set out above.

On or about May 1, 2008, two patrons of Snick's Place crawled across the bar. One was completely naked, and the other was wearing only underwear. As the patron wearing only underwear crawled across the bar, the bartender pulled the patron's underwear down. The second patron to crawl across the bar met the first patron to crawl across the bar at the end of the bar where the first patron performed oral sex on the second patron while talking to the bartender. The action set out above took place in the public portion of Snick's Place. This was in an area for which the bartenders on duty were responsible. The RESPONDENTS failed to prevent the action set out above.

On or about June 22, 2008, a patron of Snick's Place patron performed oral sex on another patron. The action set out above took place in the public portion of Snick's Place. This was in an area for which the bartenders on duty were responsible. The RESPONDENTS failed to prevent the action set out above.

On or about June 22, 2008, a patron of Snick's Place exposed his genitals and then went into the women's restroom with two other patrons and participated in various sexual activities. All activities set out above, with the exception of the allegations taking place in the women's restroom, took place in the public portion of Snick's Place. This was in an area for which the bartenders on duty were responsible. The RESPONDENTS failed to prevent the action set out above.

## STANDARD OF EVIDENCE, SUBSTANTIVE LAW AND PENALTY

### A. STANDARD OF EVIDENCE

LVMC § 6.88.090 provides:

- (A) The hearing need not be conducted according to technical rules relating to evidence and witnesses. Any relevant evidence may be admitted.
- (B) The respondent shall have the right to call and examine witnesses on his own behalf, cross-examine opposing witnesses, introduce exhibits and evidence relevant to the issues of the case, and offer rebuttal evidence.

1		(C) The respondent may be called and examined by the City.	
2 3		(D) The Clerk shall have the power to issue subpoenas for witnesses to appear to give testimony. [Emphasis added.]	
4	В.	SUBSTANTIVE LAW	
5		The Las Vegas Municipal Code mandates that the licensee is responsible for actions in	
6	their business.		
7		LVMC § 6.06.010 relates the importance of a high degree of supervision of privileged	
8	licenses/licensees:		
9		The provisions of this chapter apply to those businesses,	
10	which are found by the City Council to require a high degree of supervision and to more seriously affect the economic, social and moral well-being of the City and its residents. These businesses have been commonly referred to as "privileged" and require City Council approval for a license.		
11			
12		Council approval for a needisc.	
13		LVMC § 6.02.370 further explains the import of license violations to the public, in	
14	pertinent part:		
15		The doing of any act for which a license is required or the violation of any provision of this Title is declared to be <b>unlawful</b>	
16	and harmful to the safety, welfare, health, peace and morals of the residents and taxpayers of the City and constitutes a public		
17		nuisance per se, [Emphasis added.]	
18		LVMC § 6.02.350 in part states:	
19	A licensee under this Title shall be subject to disciplinary action not only for acts or omissions done by such licensee but		
20	also for acts and omissions done by the principals, managers, agents, representatives, servants or employees of such licensee.	also for acts and omissions done by the principals, managers, agents, representatives, servants or employees of such licensee.	
21			
22		LVMC § 6.02.330 (B) and (H) provides for appropriate disciplinary action to be taken	
23	when a	a licensee has been subject to disciplinary in another jurisdiction:	
24		The licensee may be subject to disciplinary action by the City Council for good cause, which may, without limitation,	
25		include the following:	
26			
27		(B) The licensee or any of its principals has been subject, in any jurisdiction, to disciplinary action of any kind	
28		with respect to a license, an approval for suitability, a permit or a	
		-4-	

work card to the extent that such disciplinary action reflects upon 1 the qualification, acceptability or fitness of such licensee or 2 principal; 3 (H) The business activity constitutes, promotes, causes, 4 allows, fosters, aids, or otherwise enables a private nuisance, public nuisance or chronic nuisance, or has been or is being 5 conducted in an unlawful, illegal or impermissible manner, including but not limited to causing, allowing, promoting, 6 fostering, aiding, enabling, exercising deliberate ignorance towards or failing to abate a private nuisance, public nuisance or 7 chronic nuisance . . . . 8 LVMC § 10.40.050 provides: 9 Every person who wilfully and lewdly either exposes his 10 person or the private parts thereof in any public place, or in any place where there are present other persons to be offended or 11 annoyed thereby; or procures, counsels or assists any person to expose himself, or to take part in or make any exhibition of 12 himself to public view, or to the view of any number of persons, such as is offensive to decency, or is adapted to excite vicious or 13 lewd thoughts or acts, is guilty of a misdemeanor. 14 15 LVMC § 10.42.060 states: It shall be unlawful to engage in any live sex act, 16 including but not limited to sexual intercourse, oral copulation, or sodomy, or any said sex act by implication or simulation 17 before an audience, whether it be between a male and female, male and male, female and female, human being and an animal. 18 or through the means of using an artificial device to simulate any sexual act of any kind whatsoever. 19 In addition, Nevada Gaming Commission Regulation 5.030 provides: 20 21 Violation of any provision of the Nevada gaming Control Act of these regulations by a licensee, his agent or employee shall be deemed contrary to the public health, safety, morals, good 22 order and general welfare of the inhabitants of the State of Nevada and grounds for suspension or revocation of a license. 23 Acceptance of a state gaming license or renewal thereof by a licensee constitutes an agreement on the part of the licensee to be 24 bound by all of the regulations of the commission and the same now are or may hereafter be amended or promulgated. It is the 25 responsibility of the licensee to keep himself informed of the content of all such regulations, and ignorance thereof will not 26 excuse violations. 27

### C. PENALTY

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

LVMC § 6.02.360 provides:

Upon a showing of good cause and in the discretion of the City Council, disciplinary action against a holder may take the form of cancellation, revocation, refusal to renew, suspension, imposition of conditions or restrictions or civil fine in an amount not to exceed one thousand dollars for each day that the violation which forms the subject matter of the complaint that recommends such disciplinary action is demonstrated to have been in existence, or any combination of such actions, as the particular situation may require. The Council may also impose against the licensee the actual costs incurred, and a reasonable amount for attorney's fees, resulting from the imposition of disciplinary action. The disciplinary actions available in this Section shall be in addition to, and not exclusive of, any other civil or criminal remedy which otherwise might be available. [Emphasis added.]

# LVMC § 6.50.010 provides:

The City Council declares that this Liquor Control Chapter is an exercise of the regulatory powers delegated to the City Council pursuant to the City Charter and NRS 268.090, inter alia. The regulations contained in this Chapter involve, to the highest degree, the economic, social, physical and moral well-being of the residents and taxpayers of the City. The sale or other disposition of alcoholic beverages is not a matter of right but of privilege, which would otherwise be unlawful if it were not exercised pursuant to a license. This privilege may be denied, revoked, conditioned, suspended or subjected to any other disciplinary action by the City in the exercise of its police powers for the protection of the safety, welfare, health, peace and morals of the residents and taxpayers thereof. Businesses engaged in the sale or other disposition of alcoholic beverages must therefore comply with LVMC Chapter 6.06. Nothing in this Chapter shall be construed to confer any legitimate claim of entitlement to any benefit which might otherwise devolve upon any licensee or any person approved for suitability. [Emphasis added.]

# SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS OF COMPLAINT COUNT ONE

- 1. Petitioner Department realleges and incorporates by reference as though set forth in full herein all previous paragraphs of this Disciplinary Complaint above.
- 2. On or about April 29, 2008, within the public premises of SNICK'S PLACE, INC., dba SNICK'S PLACE; said establishment owned by DOMINICK RALPH VITALE,

28 || . . .

Vegas Municipal Code §§ 6.02.330 (B)(H), 6.02.350, 6.02.370, 10.40.050, and 10.42.060

and, as such, are grounds for disciplinary action.

26

27

28

### **COUNT THREE** 1 Petitioner Department realleges and incorporates by reference as though set 2 11. forth in full herein all previous paragraphs of this Disciplinary Complaint above. 3 On or about April 30, 2008, within the public premises of SNICK'S PLACE, 12. 4 INC., dba SNICK'S PLACE; said establishment owned by DOMINICK RALPH VITALE, 5 located at 1402 South Third Street, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, two patrons of 6 SNICK'S PLACE performed oral sex on each other. 7 The conduct occurred in the public portion of SNICK'S PLACE in an area for 13. 8 which the bartenders on duty were responsible. Respondents failed to prevent the action and 9 10 conduct as stated above. This conduct by itself, and in conjunction with the actions complained of in 14. 11 other counts of this complaint, violates the municipal laws of the City of Las Vegas and is 12 harmful to the safety, welfare, health, peace and morals of the residents and taxpayers of the City. 13 Respondents' acts and failures to act as set out above are in violation of the Las 15. 14 Vegas Municipal Code §§ 6.02.330 (B)(H), 6.02.350, 6.02.370, 10.40.050, and 10.42.060 15 and, as such, are grounds for disciplinary action. 16 **COUNT FOUR** 17 Petitioner Department realleges and incorporates by reference as though set 16. 18 forth in full herein all previous paragraphs of this Disciplinary Complaint above. 19 On or about May 1, 2008, within the public premises of SNICK'S PLACE, 17. 20 INC., dba SNICK'S PLACE; said establishment owned by DOMINICK RALPH VITALE, 21 located at 1402 South Third Street, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, two patrons of 22 SNICK'S PLACE completely disrobed and masturbated the other. 23 The conduct occurred in the public portion of SNICK'S PLACE in an area for 18. 24 which the bartenders on duty were responsible. Respondents failed to prevent the action and 25 26 conduct as stated above. 27

28

. . . .

. . . .

- 19. This conduct by itself, and in conjunction with the actions complained of in other counts of this complaint, violates the municipal laws of the City of Las Vegas and is harmful to the safety, welfare, health, peace and morals of the residents and taxpayers of the City.
- 20. Respondents' acts and failures to act as set out above are in violation of the Las Vegas Municipal Code §§ 6.02.330 (B) and (H), 6.02.350, 6.02.370, 10.40.050, and 10.42.060 and, as such, are grounds for disciplinary action.

### **COUNT FIVE**

- 21. Petitioner Department realleges and incorporates by reference as though set forth in full herein all previous paragraphs of this Disciplinary Complaint above.
- 22. On or about May 1, 2008, within the public premises of SNICK'S PLACE, INC., dba SNICK'S PLACE; said establishment owned by DOMINICK RALPH VITALE, located at 1402 South Third Street, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, two patrons of SNICK'S PLACE exposed their genitals and one patron performed oral sex on the other.
- 23. The conduct occurred in the public portion of SNICK'S PLACE in an area for which the bartenders on duty were responsible. Respondents failed to prevent the action and conduct as stated above.
- 24. This conduct by itself, and in conjunction with the actions complained of in other counts of this complaint, violates the municipal laws of the City of Las Vegas and is harmful to the safety, welfare, health, peace and morals of the residents and taxpayers of the City.
- 25. Respondents' acts and failures to act as set out above are in violation of the Las Vegas Municipal Code §§ 6.02.330 (B)(H), 6.02.350, 6.02.370, 10.40.050, and 10.42.060 and, as such, are grounds for disciplinary action.

### **COUNT SIX**

- 26. Petitioner Department realleges and incorporates by reference as though set forth in full herein all previous paragraphs of this Disciplinary Complaint above.
- 27. On or about June 22, 2008, within the public premises of SNICK'S PLACE, INC., dba SNICK'S PLACE; said establishment owned by DOMINICK RALPH VITALE,

located at 1402 South Third Street, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, a patron of SNICK'S PLACE performed oral sex on another patron.

- 28. The conduct occurred in the public portion of SNICK'S PLACE in an area for which the bartenders on duty were responsible. Respondents failed to prevent the action and conduct as stated above.
- 29. This conduct by itself, and in conjunction with the actions complained of in other counts of this complaint, violates the municipal laws of the City of Las Vegas and is harmful to the safety, welfare, health, peace and morals of the residents and taxpayers of the City.
- 30. Respondents' acts and failures to act as set out above are in violation of the Las Vegas Municipal Code §§ 6.02.330 (B)(H), 6.02.350, 6.02.370, 10.40.050, and 10.42.060 and, as such, are grounds for disciplinary action.

## **COUNT SEVEN**

- 31. Petitioner Department realleges and incorporates by reference as though set forth in full herein all previous paragraphs of this Disciplinary Complaint above.
- 32. On or about June 22, 2008, within the public premises of SNICK'S PLACE, INC., dba SNICK'S PLACE; said establishment owned by DOMINICK RALPH VITALE, located at 1402 South Third Street, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, one patron of SNICK'S PLACE exposed his genitals and entered the women's rest room and engaged in various sexual activities performed oral sex on another patron.
- 33. With the exception of the conduct in the ladies' rest room, the conduct occurred in the public portion of SNICK'S PLACE in an area for which the bartenders on duty were responsible. Respondents failed to prevent the action and conduct as stated above.
- 34. This conduct by itself, and in conjunction with the actions complained of in other counts of this complaint, violates the municipal laws of the City of Las Vegas and is harmful to the safety, welfare, health, peace and morals of the residents and taxpayers of the City.
- 35. Respondents' acts and failures to act as set out above are in violation of the Las Vegas Municipal Code §§ 6.02.330 (B)(H), 6.02.350, 6.02.370, 10.40.050, and 10.42.060 and, as such, are grounds for disciplinary action.

1	WHEREFORE, the Petitioner respectfully requests the City Council to:  A. Approve the Complaint for Disciplinary Action and order a disciplinary hearing a			
2				
3	which the Respondent shall appear and show cause why the licenses that are the subject of t			
4 5	Complaint should not be suspended or revoked, or other disciplinary action taken; or			
6	B. Grant such other and further relief as the Council deems appropriate.			
7	DATED this 1142 day of August, 2009.			
9	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:			
11	0.1.0.1.1			
12	By: MARK R. VINCENT, Director			
13	Finance and Business Services			
14				
15				
16	BRADFORD JERBIC City Attorney			
17 18				
19	By: JAMES W. ERBECK			
20	Senior Litigation Counsel Chief Deputy City Attorney			
21	Nevada Bar No. 659 400 Stewart Avenue, Ninth Floor			
22	Las Vegas, NV 89101 Attorneys for CITY OF LAS VEGAS			
23	Audilieys for Cit's or LAS VEGAS			
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				